

**CIA INTERNAL USE ONLY**

OGC HAS REVIEWED.

21 May 1956

**MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director (Support)**

**SUBJECT: Building - Appropriation Hearing - Suggestion**

1. In line with your direction that I coordinate the compilation of whatever material is required to support the Director's testimony in the imminent appropriation hearing, I have assumed that you wish me to take the initiative in arranging for the inclusion of any material that might, in my judgment or that of others conversant with the problem, be required. I further assume, however, that (in addition to exercising overall approval of the completed "package") you will wish to review, as they develop, suggestions which are controversial or of more than minor significance. It is in line with this latter thought that I submit the attached for your comment.

2. It seems to me that, in the presentation to the Congress, there are two key issues to which we must respond:

Cost and Financing: Why do we need more money? Why are we going in for the appropriation now, if it will not construct a building for all our people? Are we coming back in the near future for an increased authorization, or will we postpone such a request to the indefinite future? In either case, why? Etc.

Langley: Why do we want to go to Langley? Why not any of a half dozen other places? What's all this stuff in the papers - isn't everybody opposed to Langley except CIA? Etc.

3. In my personal view, the issue of site is likely to occupy the attention of the Congress (and hence present a greater possibility of negative action by them) than is the issue of cost. In any case, we are devoting a good deal of attention to the cost question and we have already commenced the gathering and compilation of supporting material. Certainly we are all aware of the site issue and its importance; I am suggesting only one way in which this issue might be "handled", but I think it might be the most effective way.

4. I propose that the attached, or something very like it, be presented to the Committee at the beginning of the hearing, as a "prepared statement". I believe it raises all of the key points upon which our site opponents rely - and it raises them in a readily

|                |                   |  |
|----------------|-------------------|--|
| DOC: 64        | REV DATE: 13-5-81 | BY: 006199   |
| ORIG COMP: OPI | 38                | TYPE: 01   |
| ORIG CLASS: 4  | PAGES: 1          | APPROVED FOR RELEASE 2002/05/07 : CIA-RDP80-01370R000500050079-6 |
| JUST: NEXT REV | AUTH: H-2         |  |

**CIA INTERNAL USE ONLY**

**CIA INTERNAL USE ONLY**

answerable form. The vague questions like "destroying natural beauty" and "impact on the area" - unanswerable simply because they are vague, and because they depend so much upon opinion and speculation rather than fact - are subsumed under issues of our choosing, and to which convincing factual answers are available. By placing this statement in the record early, I believe we can effectively disarm our opponents and guide the Committee into the frame of reference and mode of thought which we consider most rational and compelling. The Committee can scarcely fail to be impressed by a frank, factual and "underplayed" presentation, especially when we know from past experience that our opponents are likely to present their views with some emotion.


5. Those of us who have worked closely on this problem know each tree in the forest by name. We would, perhaps, like to discuss each little point that might conceivably be in issue. Were we to do so, we might bring to Congressional attention objections that our opponents never raise; and we would surely obscure the key issues if we attempt to discuss a multiplicity of issues. Simplicity is a virtue per se, and it breeds clarity. To the Committee members, all details are new ground, however familiar they may be with our general objectives in planning a building. Up to a point, what sells soap can sell the site - concentration on a few key issues, so that the "audience" can keep them in mind and will be resistant to attempts to lead it down another track. I believe the effectiveness of the proposed statement would be destroyed if too much were included.

6. If you consider this proposal sound, I request that you release the copies provided to the addressees indicated in order that we may get the prompt benefit of their views.

  
Assistant General Counsel

STATINTL

**Attachments**

cc: Comptroller (2)  
Legislative Counsel ✓  
Building Planning Staff (2)  


STATINTL

**CIA INTERNAL USE ONLY**